



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE RENASCENCE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

It is a deplorable fact that the American public has known so little about its system of higher education. The terms "college" and "university" have conveyed no definite meaning to the "man on the outside," even though he be college-bred. Nor need we be surprised that such has been the case; for so eager has been the race after all that spells *quick success*, both from the administrative as well as from the undergraduate standpoint, that the objective of many even of our best colleges baffles definition. This fact alone would explain the regrettable inability on the part of the public to take an intelligent interest in the purpose and work of the college. Moreover, it seemed for a time that the very conditions of our social system presaged the elimination of the college as a vital force in our national life. Recent utterances in the public press, however, herald the dawning of a healthful and encouraging realization that the highest cultural welfare of our country is a social question of prime importance and that its solution cannot be arrived at through the ordinary channels of public instruction.

We have been influenced in this more recent attitude of mind to no inconsiderable extent by the opinions of European critics. The epithets, "land of the almighty dollar," "dollardom," "realm of the get-rich-quick," etc., flung in our faces by representatives of older civilizations, have begun to have their sting. While not in a position to deny the partial truth of these appellations, we are beginning to resent them; and this indicates an awakening public consciousness. The realization is gaining ground that, marvelous as has been our economic success, it may have been acquired at too great sacrifice along other lines. While this conviction is, to be sure, nothing new, yet its recent healthful significance is due to the fact that even our intelligent business men are beginning to awaken to a realization of the situation.

In keeping with this more receptive attitude of mind toward

social problems in general, the question of the purpose and future of the college is becoming more and more a vital public issue. No more conclusive evidence of this fact is needed than that Mr. Roosevelt has taken up his versatile pen in behalf of the cultural college. Interest in this live question will rapidly increase in proportion to the growing comprehension that the "college," though not less important, is not a "university"; that it is a distinctively American institution; and finally, that upon it, and not upon the university, rests in largest measure the higher intellectual and cultural welfare of our citizenship.

No word has been more misused than this word "college." Were I to attempt to list the educational hodge-podge covered by this elastic term, there would be space for little else. Scarcely less surprising is the educational bacchanalia celebrated under the no less convenient term "university." Thanks to the Carnegie Foundation, order is beginning to come out of chaos. Thinking men are beginning to realize that a high school is not a college, nor a college a university or technical school; that a university may have its college (collegiate or academic department) but that according to proper terminology the student in a Freshman or Senior class of "Wisconsin" or "Harvard" is not in the "university" but in the "college." Properly speaking, the university comprises the professional and graduate schools—and here too may be included the professional technical departments—to which a student or graduate goes for his professional training. As to the high school, it is evident to all that its purpose is largely to train the mind by systematic drill in the fundamentals and thus to lay the solid foundation upon which a technical, humanistic, or business course must rest.

The high school preparing in the fundamentals and the university and technical schools fitting for the professional careers, manifestly the college must have a different function and aim from those of the former institutions. We are beginning to see that, unlike the high school, the college should not deal with the elements of the various disciplines taught with purely practical ends in view; that, unlike the university and technical school, it should not anticipate, in any but a most subordinate way, the professional training of the student. It is just at

this point that some educators, many parents, and practically the whole of the general public have made a fundamental mistake in their conception of the purpose and result of collegiate training. Wholesale demoralization has been wrought on the one hand by the low entrance requirements of many colleges, which in robbing the high school of those who should still be on its benches have in just so far robbed themselves of one of their claims to existence; and on the other hand these same colleges, by advertising for student-getting reasons, slipshod "pre-engineering," "pre-medical," and "pre"-what-not courses, thereby anticipating university work, have lopped off the other end of the dog. A slow but sure Nemesis is overtaking the institutions that are attempting to ride two horses. Not able to do the work adequately, nevertheless to "keep in the swim" they have not only gulled the public but have duped themselves. For they have ruthlessly sacrificed their most precious birth-right—their unassailable claim to continued recognition.

The American college in its more general aspect is the outcome of a synthesis of educational methods incident to the varied national origin of our citizenship and of our ideals. In this connection, moreover, must be noted the marked and wholesome influence exerted by the long and distinguished line of educators who received their training in German universities.¹ A direct comparison cannot be drawn between our American college and the three European institutions which come in for mention—the English "College," the French "Lycée," and the German "Gymnasium." The English college exercises an oversight and tutelage over the students which is unknown in our American institution—to the advantage, in my judgment, of the latter. One of the strong claims to recognition possessed by our college, and one of its most important contributions to American character, is the fact that it has fostered a spirit of independence and initiative, which is in keeping with our democratic institutions. The recent appearance in our country of the so-called "preceptorial system," under the workings of

¹ Compare the author's article, "Die deutsche Kultur und die Amerikaner," in *Rundschau Zweier Welten*, New York, June, 1911.

which the student is placed more or less under the tutelage of a special instructor, has been necessitated largely by the growing number of students admitted by "hustling" business methods, who neither by family tradition nor personal inclination have any interest in, nor respect for, collegiate work. The Lycée and Gymnasium, both receiving very young pupils and for a period of eight years or more, have therefore a very different complexion; in neither are present all those elements of activity, eloquently summed up by the expression "college life," which with proper restrictions exert a wholesome influence upon the character of the future citizen. Both the French and German institutions have been attacked frequently on the score of their system of "intellectual servitude"—the ever-present projection of the person, oversight, and views of the instructor into the mental horizon of the student. The freedom of our American college life is in part due to the grafting of the German idea of "*akademische Freiheit*" (university freedom), in its more intellectual aspect, onto our college organization; hence the college, though not a university, for many years exercised the function of the latter before the organization of our great graduate institutions. The debt that the country owes, and will continue to owe, to the spirit of independence and confidence engendered by being thrown upon one's own resources in the formative years of life cannot be estimated. It is this principle of "*akademische Freiheit*" grafted onto the outward form of the English college, together with the mental alertness and resourcefulness called forth by the many fields of activity to be found inside our college walls, which have made the American college a unique institution in the world of education.

The question whether the college is a necessary or a superfluous institution cannot be settled by scholastic discussion. It is a question of social and political economy and will be settled as such. If the college has something to offer our social, intellectual, and moral life, which neither the high school, nor the university, nor the technical school can offer; if it has a distinct and beneficent contribution to make to American civilization, the college should remain, and an enlightened public opinion will demand its jealous preservation. If, on the other hand, it but ac-

compleishes what a year or two added to the high school together with the professional school can do equally well, and even more cheaply, then by all means the college should go. In this day and generation there is no time, no room, for any reduplication in our educational system. Should we not then free ourselves from all cant and concede that a college course is superfluous, or should not thinking men and women, college faculties and college presidents, take a firm stand, insist—even at the risk of losing students—that the college has its own distinct and high calling, and preserve its integrity against all compromise which all too often verges upon educational charlatanry? How many excellent colleges are there, which, without a cent having been added to their endowment or a chair to the faculty, blossom out over night in their catalogues with “civil-engineering,” “chemical-engineering,” “electrical-engineering,” and other scientific courses! This Pallas-springing-fullfledged-from-the-head-of-Jove-ism in college administration is educational quackery of the very worse kind. It is all the more serious because retroactive. Not only are students and public deceived and incalculable injury done to young men who should have attended some professional school whose faculty of specialists in those lines would outnumber many times over the whole college faculty, but a spirit of superficiality and utilitarianism invades the intellectual atmosphere of the college.

An honor man upon graduation from one of our better smaller colleges which was endeavoring to blossom out along scientific lines, surprised his friends by saying that he did not want the Bachelor of Arts degree which had been conferred on him, because, as he stated, the Bachelor of Science degree was “higher.” He explained his attitude of mind by saying that the sciences had better buildings, better equipment, that the president was always talking about what he had done and was going to do for the scientific courses, and thus during his four years of residence, though of a literary turn of mind, he had gotten the idea that “science” was “the thing.” What an exchange is made when the true ideals and aims of the college are cheaply bartered for a few additional students!

The shameless competition in the educational field has vitiated

the fundamental aims of collegiate instruction. Standards have had to be adapted to the needs of the "average man," which has discouraged all attempts at real, intensive scholarship. The conception has gained ground that the college is a "finishing school"; hence the crowding of halls with students (?) whose families and whose ambitions are in little or no sympathy with the real purpose of the college. From their ranks are recruited the "snobs" of college life who "decorate" the offices of the various student organizations and who instil those false ambitions which have given rise to that anomalous thing a "college sentiment" that measures success by non-collegiate standards of individual gain—a sentiment which deprives a democracy of that moral and political sense of justice upon which an enlightened nation must depend.

The harm done by the diversion of the funds and of the efforts necessary to the well-being and development of the "liberal" courses into so-called semi-vocational, scientific expansion in what are now and probably always will be colleges, is almost beyond repair. An illogical and demoralizing competition has been brought about between the colleges and technical schools. Germany has handled the matter more intelligently. Instead of weakening her "literary" Gymnasien by throwing down the bars to all sorts of experimental educational tendencies, she has created separate institutions—Real-Gymnasien and the yet more radical Real-Schulen—to satisfy a variety of tastes and needs. In this way students of different inclinations of mind are kept in a congenial atmosphere and thus the nation has been able to preserve to itself a select body of young men of high attainments who go into the world free from all those ideals of "practicality" so common with us. Even the German universities are in a large measure free from the inroads of ultra-utilitarianism, for the great technical and engineering schools—Technische Hochschulen—are entirely distinct institutions.

Scarcely less insidious in effect than the advertising of high-sounding courses has been the practice of some of the smaller colleges of employing instructors who are not specially trained men. So long as the course "goes on," so long as they "hold down" their classes, they seem to give satisfaction. Even one

such "make-shift" man, whatever be his age or dignity, in the faculty of the smaller college undermines the morale of both students and faculty. It is a situation that would not be tolerated even in the better high schools. Such an institution does not possess the true college atmosphere; for students, faculty, and public may well say to themselves that, if one such man satisfies the expectations of the administration, then why could not all the chairs in that institution be equally satisfactorily filled by men of that class. The effects of a reactionary and deplorable policy of this kind are more quickly felt in the student and alumni body than some college executives seem to realize. The moment that the factors of cheapness and superficiality enter into the college atmosphere, the day of usefulness of that institution as a college has ended. This situation has in many cases been caused by strained financial conditions due to unfortunate and expensive ambitions along semi-vocational lines.

The time has come when even the most progressive friends of the modern college—men who both by natural inclination, university training, and active public interests are in hearty sympathy with more effective and more scientific method in collegiate instruction and administration—must needs admit to a growing realization of the fact that *we have reached a crisis in our college development, that we have gone too far in the "modernization" of the curriculum, that our ideals must be readjusted, or that the college must go.*

It is significant that an engineer—a so-called "practical" man—Mr. M. L. Cooke, employed by the Carnegie Foundation to investigate the efficiency of college organization, should close his report with this quotation from Ex-President Eliot: "Education for efficiency must not be materialistic, prosaic, nor utilitarian, it must be idealistic, humane, and passionate, or it will not reach its goal." The only claim that the American college can make to continued recognition, confidence, and patronage is on the ground that it offers just these very elements mentioned by Dr. Eliot, which are so sorely needed in our American civilization—these elements of "culture" in the highest sense which neither the high school nor the professional school can give.

A college then differentiates itself from the preparatory and professional institutions in that the central sun about which all the planetary courses revolve is not the idea of *preparation*, nor *profession*, nor *trade*, but *culture*. Only a year or two since, the use of this word "culture" would have elicited in many quarters a smile of good-natured toleration or of supercilious condescension. Within the last year, however, the most important magazines and periodicals in all parts of the country have opened their pages to articles dealing with the subject. And well they might, for, in the mad race after "the quickly attainable," the very meaning of the word had lost its significance even to many educators. Recently a college professor was invited to address a large educational convention and chose as his subject, "The Factor of 'Culture' in the College Curriculum." The secretary of the organization replied that they were much pleased with the subject, but "it is due you to be informed that the same subject is already upon the programme, another speaker having announced as his subject, 'Physical Culture in College.'" Still more recently one of the best-known educators of the country made the statement that "Any subject well taught is cultural, for example *shoemaking*." I would not be understood as intimating that culture means the preclusion of sympathy between the college and practical life, they being manifestly interdependent; but I do believe that in the college all else is to be subordinated to the idea of disinterested culture. The attainment of culture does not mean the ability to inflect all the Greek verbs, nor the learning of all the rules for the sequence of tenses in Latin, nor the ability to speak German, nor an extensive grasp of philosophical definitions, *et cetera*. A student might have drained to the last drop all this supposedly culture-producing medicament and yet not be a cultured man. Culture means far more than mere rules and theorems and technical ability.

Charles Eliot Norton called culture "the imagination that lifts man from the petty, transient, and physical interests that engross the greater part of his time and thoughts in self-regarding pursuits, to the large, permanent, and spiritual interests that ennoble his nature and transform him from a solitary individual

into a member of the brotherhood of the human race." This definition would make *intelligent men*, not *literary monks*. It is the "homo sum ; humani nihil a me alienum puto" of Terence. Although culture does not necessarily enable a man to create anything but makes a man to *be* something, yet it must not be envisaged as a mere luxury. Not only is the very intellectual life of the nation dependent upon it for the gift of universal sympathy which it bestows, but whole departments of knowledge are closed to him who has not been touched by its magic. "History, as a whole," said Goldwin Smith, "cannot be studied until the moral unity of the race be thoroughly felt." These "spiritual interests that ennoble," this idea "homo sum," this "moral unity of the race," cannot be brought home to high school pupils in the tender years of youth, nor can they be made a part of the busy professional courses.

This element of culture, which someone has called "the fruit of knowledge married to sympathy," is the corner-stone upon which the whole structure of the curriculum must rest. Sacrifice it and you have withdrawn from the college its very reason of existence. After years of close acquaintanceship with the educational systems of the Old World, I unhesitatingly pronounce *the ideal American college the biggest dynamic intellectual potential in the world of education*. I would deplore the elimination of the college as a distinct and irreparable loss to our democratic institutions. Its gradual extinguishment, between the encroachment of the high school on the one hand and of the professional schools on the other, would mean the uncoupling of the last balance-wheel to our opportunistic, utilitarian, time-is-money American tendencies. I would cast no reflection upon that eminently necessary specialization and expertism that properly follows or even ignores the broadly liberal, cultural college course, but merely upon any form of higher intellectual training that overlooks and decries spiritual values or claims to supply their equivalent. Professor Wendley, of the University of Michigan, himself a product of the fine cultural atmosphere of Scotch schools, well says, "The expert (without cultural training) thus let loose for punishment upon the people who shout for him, is that paradoxical animal—an

educated man who knows nothing about the relative values of life."

In case these lines may fall under the eye of some *business man* who may feel that what has been said about "culture," "spirituality," "sympathy," and the rest of it, is but airy nothingness, empty phraseology, when compared with the tangible facts of skyscrapers and flying machines, I shall quote an extract from a letter recently received from the secretary of the largest manufactory of its kind in this country, a man who directs a gigantic business enterprise, and who will therefore not be accused of scholastic narrowness. He writes:—"It makes me tired to hear a graduate in pharmacy or a graduate from the engineering course of the University of —, or the product of one of the numerous bread-and-butter courses, talk as if he had enjoyed a college education. Really that's a joke. What do these engineers and pharmacists and chemists know about a liberal education—one that enlarges and elevates the mind, enlightens the taste, and enriches the whole man? These polytechnic courses are very like in kind the bookkeeping courses of the so-called 'business colleges.' . . . I do not belittle the fact that the country needs well-trained engineers, civil, mechanical, electrical, chemists and pharmacists . . . but they have their nerve to pretend that they are liberally educated men. My notion of a liberal education embraces literature, history, philosophy, political economy, art—the things that are calculated to fill a man's mind with what Burke calls 'large and liberal ideas.'" Words like these from out the realm of business may be taken as an encouraging sign of a change of attitude in the public mind.

The most significant phenomenon in the sphere of education in these latter days is the strong counter-current that seems to be setting in against the utilitarian tendencies run mad of the last decade. Harvard's change of policy toward the wholesale elective system, which, however innocently, gave originally such impetus to the natural American leaning toward all that bears the stamp of "quick success" and "bring-in-the-dollars-fast," is the beginning, I believe, of a great, irresistible wave of reform. The dawn of this twentieth century renaissance is yet more

clearly foreshadowed by the recent gift of \$3,000,000 to found from the ground up a *college* with no university nor technical ambitions. Evidently our American civilization is beginning to feel the lack of

“ . . . something better, more adorned
Than is the common aspect, daily garb
Of human life.”

In other words, the battle-cry, “Quick success at any cost,” is, somehow or other, beginning to have a false ring.

Of far-reaching significance in this connection is the recent recommendation of the class of 1885 to the Trustees of Amherst College, advising the elimination of the scientific (B.S.) degree and the concentration of funds and efforts (including the payment of large salaries to a picked faculty) upon what should be the true ideals of collegiate training—the attainment of disinterested culture.

It is “the duty of Amherst,” says the address of the committee presented by Mr. E. Parmlee Prentice of New York, “to take a distinctive public position as a representative of that individual training and general culture which was once the purpose of all American colleges. We believe that the college should take this position, as a duty owing to its students, as an opportunity for a great public service, and in its own interest as a matter of self-preservation. . . . Is there no distinctive field which Amherst may occupy? . . . We believe there is such a field; that there are public services which Amherst may render; that there are signs of reaction from present conditions. . . . The popular appraisal of education is commercial . . . and if every man stands for himself this appraisal may be right. It is in the relation of the individual to the community that this view of educational training first breaks down. . . . There is a training which should be undergone for the sake of learning and for the benefit of the State. . . . It is the belief of the class of 1885 that the colleges of the country have permitted themselves to be led aside from their true function, that some reaction is inevitable, and that no college can better lead such a movement than Amherst.”

This document has the ring of a veritable Magna Charta of cultural rights.

The encroachment of the "useful" on the more cultural disciplines—the decried self-assertiveness of the modern languages and the sciences—was not the fundamental cause of the "modern trend" in things educational. The displaced classical disciplines of the old college curriculum have themselves a mighty load of responsibility to bear for the situation. Professor Percy Hughes of Lehigh does not miss the bull's-eye far when he says, "Few instructors are less liberal, in the fundamental significance of the term, than many teachers of the subjects which are traditionally styled liberal." He might have gone further and cited many of the professors of the classics; for instead of kindling in the hearts of students "high and passionate" thoughts, instead of being interpreters to the New World of the mighty heritage of literary and artistic ideals of the Ancient World, they degenerated in the majority of colleges into mere expounders of syntactical difficulties and correctors of themes. It was their unpardonable failure to recognize the grave responsibility that rested upon them, which gives the opportunity to scientific men, representing the "practical" side in the controversy, to exclaim with Professor Stevenson of New York University: "For more than half a century the gospel of culture has been preached by college graduates, who, too often, are themselves living proofs of its falsity." The cultural efficiency then of the college cannot depend upon vain ideals. It must rest upon *what* is taught within its walls and *how* it is taught by men whose specialization, rare gifts, and exceptional fitness should guarantee them salaries which would prevent them from steering toward university chairs.

The supplanting of the classics by the modern languages¹ has placed grave responsibilities upon the representatives of these latter branches. The claim that they are "practical" subjects, which has carried them on the current of progress thus far, will be flimsy oars in the sea of reaction in which the college is beginning to find itself. The French and German languages are storehouses of limitless inspiration when taught from the stand-

¹ Compare the author's article, "The Modern Languages as Cultural College Disciplines," *Educational Review*, Columbia University, May, 1911.

point of the literary, political, social, and artistic development of those races, but, like the ancient languages, they are miserable things as instruments of real culture, if taught purely as languages and divested of their inspiring adornment, not of mere words, but of ideas. Let the student but once catch the idea of the inter-relationship of the literary, historical, and æsthetic disciplines, let him but grasp the idea that they reflect the marvelous unfolding of the human mind through the ages, he will no longer need *teaching*, he will *grow*. This is true culture. This should be the single goal of all collegiate training. The sciences also are veritably cultural and eminently desirable, but they should be taught by men who are alive to their general relation to the liberalizing and balanced scheme of the curriculum and who will not mislead the student by any false notion of their vocational value as over and against the less directly financially remunerative branches. Any claims to preëminence on the part of the sciences in the college curriculum, either as disciplines or anticipatory vocational courses, will not contribute to the best interests of true collegiate culture.

One of the most encouraging signs that we are reverting to a higher conception of the function of the college is the rapid introduction into the curriculum of the History of Art taught from its more philosophic side.¹ The idea prompting its introduction was not only that there is too little æsthetic training in our academic departments, but also that it will tend to counterbalance the materialistic tendencies of the curriculum. In advocating the History of Art as a college study there is, of course, no thought of any technical instruction, that obviously being solely the business of the art schools. It has been realized that the Fine Arts, influenced as they are by the political, religious, economic, and material conditions of their environment, are the most direct reflection of the civilization and mentality of a people and that the History of Art cannot be studied seriously without taking into consideration all these

¹ Compare the author's article, "The History of Art as a College Discipline," Supplement *Art and Progress*, Washington, July, 1910, and *Education*, Boston, September, 1910.

factors. When taught by a man as familiar with history and literature as with art, and as a senior course, it would not only serve to gather into a related whole many otherwise seemingly unrelated subjects but would tend to inspire a cosmopolitanism of vision and a respect for the past which are the watermarks of real culture.

In view of what has been said it would therefore seem that recent criticism, far from furnishing an argument for the discontinuance of the college, confirms the conviction that the present strong trend toward a higher appreciation of cultural values means the dawn of a new era of splendid usefulness for the college. The indications are that the college will become, what it necessarily should be, an institution for men of marked ability and not an institution which, as President Schurman puts it, "revolves about the average man, with a strong pull in the direction of mediocrity." The outcome of such a policy would mean the survival of scarcely more than one great college of highest standards in each state. The greatest immediate gain to accrue from this higher conception of collegiate work and consequent elimination of weak institutions would be the discontinuance of the deplorable wasteful flow of contributions into the coffers of institutions whose fate is a foregone conclusion. Both colleges and philanthropists owe Dr. Pritchett a deep debt of gratitude for having called public attention to this thoughtless waste of funds and reduplication of useless and weak institutions caused by well-meaning, but misguided, denominational zeal.

In this connection it should be said that no greater service could be done Christian education in America to-day than by the widest possible extension of the principle of "independent and self-perpetuating boards of trustees." I do not believe, as a general rule, that the ultimate control by religious denominations has been exercised in a narrowly sectarian sense. But the public thinks otherwise. The jealous manner in which some church bodies have clung to the rights of "supervision" or of "veto" has created the impression, even among the most respected portion of our population, that the denominations are guarding this prerogative of control from no disinterested nor broadly humanitarian motive. It is unfortunate for the de-

nominations themselves, as well as for the cause of collegiate education, that the reproach of "mediævalism," "bigotry" and "denominationalism" has been permitted by the churches themselves to injure the standing and the influence of many institutions which are denominational only in name. The country is beginning to be suspicious of the educational efficiency of "church schools" which are endeavoring to keep their constituency largely through the "denominational argument."

If my contention regarding the inestimable value of the college to the nation be sound, a unique and splendid field of philanthropy lies before a Carnegie or a Rockefeller who may be willing to immortalize himself by devoting his wealth to the guaranteeing for all time to the people of each of the states yet destitute of such an institution, one great Amherst or Williams or Dartmouth to be the home in that state of disinterested collegiate culture. Those forms of intellectual pursuits which are less apparently and quickly remunerative are at a distinct disadvantage in the state university over and against all the tangible allurements of the scientific, agricultural, mechanical, and professional courses. Moreover, as the literary subjects are elected by large numbers of women, the immature student in the state institution gets the false impression that these subjects necessarily must be effeminate. The state universities as a whole can, in my judgment, never expect to offer the kind of atmosphere which encourages, on the part of the undergraduate, an appreciation of disinterested, liberal training—that higher kind of idealism which is just as essential to the intellectual welfare of the nation as is expertism to its economic progress.

The chartering of one great, humanistic institution in each state, pledged by its charter for all time to the unique fostering of literary, historical, æsthetic, and moral culture, with that grounding in the sciences compatible with, and so necessary to, a liberal education, would be a greater and more needed gift to the American people than any other form of existing benefaction. These institutions would receive the select men of the country, their endowments rendering unnecessary any but the highest standards of scholarship and their charters prohibiting all catering to ephemeral educational whims and the present disgraceful

forms of "hustling" competition. I have no fear of the senseless cries against an "intellectual aristocracy." That is just what we want, and must have, unless we desire to convert ourselves into a socialistic Arcadia with something of the form of a Boer republic. The liberally trained and therefore sympathetic "intellectual aristocrat," as his traducers would term him, is essential to public welfare. "Democracy as a permanent world force," wrote Mr. Roosevelt, "must mean not only the raising of the general level, but also the raising of the standard of excellence to which only exceptional individuals can attain."

I would not be understood as being out of sympathy with scientific investigation and industrial training in all their forms. Far from it. I am a believer in the most thorough and complete training of experts in all these great fields of activity. I am a hearty supporter of state institutions and great technical schools. I do not advocate technical training *less* but liberal training *more*, and for the very simple reason that our American inclinations run *ipso facto* towards the former and because it is, and will be, provided for. Not so, however, with the undergraduate, humanistic branches, which are destined either to eke out a precarious and servile existence in the dangerously overshadowing and chilling utilitarian and practical atmosphere of the state universities, or which must be nurtured as tender but none the less necessary elements of our life in separate, great, but not rival colleges—institutions inculcating the ideas of a world not of mere interest, but of ideals. In this direction, I believe, and in this direction only, lies the renaissance of the college as a vital force in our national life.

THOMAS LINDSEY BLAYNEY.

Central University of Kentucky.